

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action dated December 30, 2005.

No claims are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-36 remain pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-8, 11-15, 19-24, 28-30, and 32 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hojabri (U.S. 6,236,269).

Applicant respectfully traverses and submits that *prima facie* anticipation has not been established. In particular, Applicant is unable to find, in Hojabri, a teaching or suggestion of a bulk input port, as recited in claim 1. The portions of Hojabri noted in the Office Action, including Fig. 2, do not appear to teach or suggest all recited elements. Applicant notes that the Office Action appears silent as to a bulk input port in Hojabri.

For this and other reasons, it appears that Hojabri does not teach or disclose all recited elements of claim 1. Thus, it appears that the record does not evince *prima facie* anticipation on the basis of Hojabri. Reconsideration and allowance of pending claim 1 is respectfully requested.

As to claims 11 and 19, Applicant respectfully submits that Hojabri does not teach or disclose a first input node at the first bulk (as recited in claim 11), or providing an input signal to a bulk terminal of the first transistor (as recited in claim 19).

For these and other reasons, it appears that Hojabri does not teach or disclose all recited elements of claims 11 and 19. Thus, it appears that the record does not evince *prima facie* anticipation on the basis of Hojabri. Reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 11 and 19 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 3-8, 12-15 and 20-24 are believed to be in condition for allowance and, since each also recites an additional element, it is respectfully submitted that each is in condition for allowance.

As to dependent claims 28-30 and 32, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is inconsistent with the Office Action treatment of independent claim 26, rejected solely under 35

USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hojabri. Clarification or allowance of pending claims 28-30 and 32 is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 26 and 28-35 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hojabri (U.S. 6,236,269).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that *prima facie* obviousness has not been established on the basis of Hojabri and the knowledge of one of skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The cited document does not teach or suggest all elements of the claimed subject matter. For example, the record does not clearly teach or suggest a bulk input port. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that *prima facie* obviousness has not been established.

Further, the Office Action does not appear to set forth the requisite motivation for combining Hojabri with the knowledge of one of skill in the art at the time of the invention. The asserted motivation for the proposed combination, according to page 3 of the Office Action, is "to have a practical use for the circuit (first amplifier) of Hojabri since this is well known in the art and a matter of design choice." Applicant respectfully traverses and submits that such reasoning is inadequate to establish *prima facie* obviousness and is merely a generalized statement that provides no basis upon which one of skill in the art would select Hojabri for combining in the manner proposed.

Thus, Applicant submits that the Office Action has not set forth the requisite findings, based on evidence of record, nor has the Office Action established cogent reasoning by which those findings support the assertion of obviousness.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 26 and 28-35 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 9, 10, 16-18, 25, 27, and 36 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that each of claims 2, 9, 10, 16-18, 25, 27, and 36 are dependent on claims believed to be in condition for allowance and, since each also recites an additional element, it is respectfully submitted that each is in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

ARIEL COHEN

By his Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 373-6911

Date March 27, 2006

By 
David W. Black
Reg. No. 42,331

Date of Deposit: March 27, 2006

This paper or fee is being filed on the date indicated above, using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.